



State of Oklahoma

OFFICE OF JUVENILE AFFAIRS

Board of Juvenile Affairs and Board of Oklahoma Youth Academy Charter School

Meeting Minutes

October 16, 2019

Board Members Present

Sean Burrage
Tony Caldwell
Amy Emerson
Janet Foss
Stephen Grissom
Mautra Jones (arrived at 9:01 a.m.)
Jenna Worthen
Karen Youngblood (arrived at 9:01 a.m.)

Absent

Timothy Tardibono

Guests

Twyla Snider, Linda Shaw, Ada Fox, TJ Bailey, Brewana Myers, Darla Slipke, Lisa Williams

Present from the Office of Juvenile Affairs

Janelle Bretten, Steven Buck, Paula Christiansen, Kevin Clagg, Donna Glandon, Rachel Holt, Michael McNutt, Carol Miller, Len Morris, Audrey Rockwell, Leticia Sanchez, Paul Shawler, Matt Stangl, Amy Stuart, Paula Tillison, Shelley Waller, and Melissa White

Call to Order

Chair Caldwell called the October 16, 2019, meeting of the Board of Juvenile Affairs and Board of Oklahoma Youth Academy Charter School to order at 9:00 a.m. and requested roll be called.

Public Comment

No public comments.

Director's Report

Director Buck ran through his report.

Presentation from Thunder Ridge youth

Youth discussed working his program through Thunder Ridge, his time in school and the career tech program.

Presentation on recommended Rates and Standards

No public comment on the proposed rates and standards.

Mr. Clagg ran through the attached rates and standards presentation.

Chair Caldwell: So we continue to promulgate rates we've been doing this almost every month the entire year. And I think it's worthwhile just to stop if we take action here and just remind everybody that really what we're trying to do, with the rate making process is to encourage those we engage with you provide services to the children in our care to extend and expand what they're doing. So we're trying to encourage people to think outside of their own box, and to provide outcomes, we really focused on outcomes, not just service delivery. So lots of discussion goes into this process from our staff so you know what is it we're trying to have happen, what is it we want to be true when finished here. And then how do we properly incentivize people, one of the things that we've seen not only with these rates but other rates we've already promulgated and certainly with the rates that we're going to begin to consider later this year, is increasing the amount of rates. And I think that's also significant I just want to make sure that we at least comment on it. For the last three years, before the whitelist this current fiscal year, the state had a pretty serious financial crisis. We were fortunate in that we didn't really receive any cuts, to our overall budget, some might argue that by not receiving cuts we actually received an increase. I don't see it that way but it gave us the opportunity to really revisit this stuff so now with a little more flexibility, really created by the administrative savings and rethinking with some of the programs and things that we're doing, we're have some flexibility here to actually increase these rates. We haven't received any more money in a number of years. And so, it's only because of the internal reorganization and efficiencies that we've gained, we have the ability to even consider paying more money to our service providers. One of the challenges I think we have in front of us, especially with this fiscal budget year coming forward for next year, that looks like you won't have the kind of financial flexibility to use their last year, is making sure that we receive the appropriations needed to sustain these rates, so that we don't actually have to do any cutting. Hopefully, what we get out of this process is a better outcome. And I think the challenge for our staff especially is to make sure that that happens. I expect this rate setting, and this has been an unusual year in the rates and standards committee, and the people who will work to support it in the rate making process have been really busy compared to previous years, at least in my experience, and we're going to continue to be that way. I think now the challenge, after promulgating these rates, is to step back a year from now and ask ourselves, did we get what we thought we were getting out of the process. One of the things that Kevin mentioned was that we're creating flexibility here. What we're really trying to do, as the Director also made the comment, especially with respective youth services agencies where we had this conversation earlier last year, actually, is to untie the hands of the people who are doing the work and recognize that the people closest to the problem, often have the best solutions and answers. And so you give them the flexibility to do the work that makes sense to them with the chores in front of them and paying them adequately, but at the same time expect that they deliver a result. So results are really critical. So this is a big experiment, really for us and then changing the way we've done business for a

long time. I think it's working well for us, as the Director said earlier with youth service agencies and the rest of this remains to be seen. I just wanted to comment, because what appears to be a fairly simple process isn't, it's actually a fairly complex conversation that has been taking place, we even get into fairly minutiae conversations like why are we paying 15 minutes. There's all kinds of questions, I just want you to know that at the committee level we're really trying to ask questions and make sure that we're doing the very best job we can.

Director Buck: Can I supplement one thing with that, for those who are new to the board, the Chair's absolutely right, the Legislature has been very kind to us throughout the difficult budget years, the Legislature and the Governor. We did have to take cuts through the revenue failures which were across the board for all agencies. Through revenue failure cuts we had significant reduction in our contracts with our youth service agencies, detention operators and group homes. And so this year the new money that we did receive from the Legislature was not a rate increase, it was only restoration of the cuts made through the revenue failure. And so, to the chairs point, we are very glad that we were able to help harness taxpayer dollars to help our providers have more success within our existing budgetary framework. I appreciate your comments but from a historical perspective, cuts that did come from across the board revenue failures.

Dr. Grissom: Any provider receiving these monies would be required to be certified by the Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services?

Mr. Clagg and Director Buck: Yes, on the substance abuse side, that is correct.

Dr. Grissom: I want to make sure I was clear on that point that only people certified to do these things by ODMH.

Director Buck: Dr. Grissom, I'm so pleased you raise that as a matter of record. In order to provide substance abuse treatment services in the state of Oklahoma, it is required that you have a certification through the Oklahoma Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services. That's a statutory requirement, so even though we have our own designation of youth service agencies, only those agencies that have received that certification would be eligible to bill these rates, thank you for that excellent clarification.

Discussion and/or possible vote to approve rates and standards for Juvenile Relapse Avoidance Project (JRAP) Substance Abuse Assessment, RS20-001-01 - \$110.33 per event

Dr. Burrage moved to approve with a second by Ms. Jones and Mr. Burrage.

Aye: Burrage, Caldwell, Emerson, Foss, Grissom, Jones, Worthen, and Youngblood
Absent: Tardibono

Rates and standards for JRAP Substance Abuse Assessment, RS20-001-01 - \$110.33 per event approved.

Discussion and/or possible vote to approve rates and standards for JRAP Substance Abuse Service Plan Development & Relapse Prevention Plan Development, RS20-001-02 - \$142.08 per event

Mr. Burrage moved to approve with a second by Ms. Jones

Aye: Burrage, Caldwell, Emerson, Foss, Grissom, Jones, Worthen, and Youngblood

Absent: Tardibono

Rates and standards for JRAP Substance Abuse Service Plan Development & Relapse Prevention Plan Development, RS20-001-02 - \$142.08 per event approved.

Discussion and/or possible vote to approve rates and standards for JRAP Substance Abuse Service Plan/ Relapse Prevention Plan Update, Review, or Modification, RS20-001-03 - \$82.28 per event

Dr. Grissom moved to approve with a second by Mr. Burrage

Aye: Burrage, Caldwell, Emerson, Foss, Grissom, Jones, Worthen, and Youngblood

Absent: Tardibono

Rates and standards for JRAP Substance Abuse Service Plan/ Relapse Prevention Plan Update, Review, or Modification, RS20-001-03 - \$82.28 per event approved.

Discussion and/or possible vote to approve rates and standards for JRAP Substance Abuse Individual Counseling, RS20-001-04 - \$20.57 per 15 minutes of time working directly with client

Mr. Burrage moved to approve with a second by Ms. Jones

Aye: Burrage, Caldwell, Emerson, Foss, Grissom, Jones, Worthen, and Youngblood

Absent: Tardibono

Rates and standards for JRAP Substance Abuse Individual Counseling, RS20-001-04 - \$20.57 per 15 minutes of time working directly with client approved.

Discussion and/or possible vote to approve rates and standards for JRAP Substance Abuse Group Counseling – RS20-001-05 - \$9.56 per 15 minutes per client

Mr. Burrage moved to approve with a second by Ms. Jones

Aye: Burrage, Caldwell, Emerson, Foss, Grissom, Jones, Worthen, and Youngblood

Absent: Tardibono

Rates and standards for JRAP Substance Abuse Group Counseling – RS20-001-05 - \$9.56 per 15 minutes per client approved.

Update on the Next Generation Campus Project

Video presentation and Mr. Kevin Clagg gave a brief status of the where the project currently stands.

Vice Chair Youngblood: I just have a comment, I'm actually surprised by watching the video. It is very overwhelming to see the construction starting, we've talked about it for so long. We've been out there and visited it and we've seen the kids and we've talked to the kids. Talked to them about how they don't enjoy their facility and hearing him talk about the philosophy of how they want to treat our children, and the kind of living conditions that they'll be in and it's amazing what a difference construction can make. I'm just wonderfully overwhelmed, we're actually moving forward and we're seeing the destruction of these old facilities that when we walk through are just so tired and sad, and it's so exciting. So I appreciate that view into such something so truly live and candid and able to see what's going on. Thank you.

Mr. Clagg: Working on this so long and talking about it so much. It's good to see some actual work occurring and to see this thing, start to rise up.

Steve: Kevin you failed me because you were supposed to put a picture of the fish in the video. So you might recall, I think it was in the September meeting, I discussed the work we had done with the Oklahoma Department of Wildlife and they had actually taken us out on a fishing trip and come out and done a stunning of fish. It's humane and the fish return to the water. They completed a stunning of fish to get a fish count of our two ponds. The two ponds on the property are not being developing right now and we'll have future conversations about what that could look like. They were able, through the stunning, to identify at least one six pound large-mouth bass. So if any of you are recreational fishermen or fisherwomen, you will know, that a six pound large-mouth is a rather choice fish, so we're very thrilled with that additional asset to our property. You can tell where I am going to start spending my weekends.

Chair Caldwell: It has been a long time to get to this point. It leads me to ask the projected completion date.

Kevin: I have to think about this because I work in fiscal years and most people work in calendar years so let's see this is coming up on 2020, projected completion is March of 2021.

Chair Caldwell: I think this is too long. A reminder, we will also have the ability to house young women, who will also benefit.

Director Buck: They will also benefit but as a reminder to the governing board as of today, and it has been this way for several months, there are no young women who are have navigated to the need for highest level of care, and that is that we would love to continue.

Discussion on current juvenile justice trends, best practices, detention rates and usage and possible vote to approve establishment of a formula to determine appropriate number of detention beds to amend the State Plan for the Establishment of Secure Detention

Chief Operating Officer and Senior General Counsel Rachel Holt walked through detention statutes and her work with the judiciary on proper use of detention. Mr. Clagg gave a presentation on detention utilization and current trend lines, statistics, length of stay.

Chair Caldwell: This is a fairly comprehensive presentation, as well as the plan documents we've also seen prior to the meeting. I wonder, before we get into that, as I think deserves its own discussion, if you might stop and ask if there are any questions or comments about the presentation up until this point.

Judge Foss: I think detention is one of those areas that's really important, because this is where you're going to see the state and local people clashing. And I can tell you that there's a fundamental difference in philosophy about it. I'm not sure how to express it but... I think there's this animosity toward the agency that comes out of you know this type of thing. I can tell listening to Rachel and I could see where some judges aren't going to like her. Yeah, they're not going to like her because they're going to feel like she doesn't understand what they're dealing with. You're not the one sitting there, you don't see what is before them. I can give you scenario after scenario after scenario that just doesn't fit these little tiny boxes. As a judge, you have got to make these quick decisions and somebody, after the fact, wants to come down and criticize what you did. I just think you got to be really careful in this area with how you handle it. You need to figure out a way really to communicate and work with people on a local level to understand, we're all really working together here and we're not trying to prevent you from having access to something. They will also tell you on the local level, I'm getting a big feel for this is, that they feel like OJA custody kids take priority over everything. And to some extent they should probably, but OJA, last time I read the statutes, is also charged with responsibility for all youth, whether they're in custody or not. I mean in terms of intake, prevention, I mean this is what this agency is charged with doing. If OJA doesn't want them to detain, then give us some alternatives because there have not been viable alternatives. I think detention is over utilized for that for that fact. So if you start talking about doing away with beds or we can't do this. You can't do that. You have to have viable alternatives. They've got to be funded. And I think until you get those in place. You're still going to have these problems with inappropriate detention. I mean, you know, it's costing the state money when it happens but there's no real sanctions for doing it other than to the state's money.

Chair Caldwell: I would just add to the comments you made, this is probably the most intractable problem that we face in the system. When you look at the way our juvenile justice system is designed, it has great strength in that it involves a lot more players in the system at the community level and the state level and that's a tremendous strength. One of the benefits, for example, of having youth service agencies dealing with problems in their communities are solutions tailored for their communities by people in their communities. Hopefully it works better for their community, than a one size all one size fits all solution. I think we've made a lot of progress in that area, particularly in actually allowing those folks to do what the system was

designed and intended for them to do when it was put together 25 years ago, but has not been allowed for the last two decades. The same problem exists, and you put your finger right on it, with judges at the local level and the fact that everything is not the niceties which don't really exist in this world. Judges, and I think we all would give credit to judges who try to do the best thing they can in protecting their communities and the children that they're dealing with. If you go watch the juvenile court process here in Oklahoma County its clear judges have a really big challenge. At the same time, we statutorily have responsibilities that were charged with. And I think everybody in the system has to make a decision to follow the law or not follow the law. And if the law is wrong or misguided or inadequate you know we have to change the law.

Judge Foss: Or subject to interpretation.

Chair Caldwell: That's also true. I think Rachel made that very point, do you stack detention 5 days at a time up to 60 days or do you not stack. So, lawsuits have to be filed or legislators have to clarify. Right. In the meantime, you know, our responsibility, I think, is to try to always look after the best interest of the children as well as following the law, which means that we're going to be opposed to other people who are also trying to follow the best interest of children and follow the law with a different perspective. We can't solve all those problems in the state plan for detention, I think it warrants a much more serious conversation that's taking place now with all the stakeholders, or, I guess, in an ideal sense from a legislative point of view, is the sort of thing you take a serious study over a period of time, with the legislature bringing everybody together. I think we ought to take some leadership and encourage this conversation so we can solve some of these questions about how we going to do business going forward. I think that's necessary, because as long as I've been here I keep hearing the same issue which is okay then the judges are a problem. I think you bring the judges to the table to discuss their own setbacks. And, you know, I would just hope that this is going to take us two or three months to finish this plan. I hope as we think about this as a step forward but not a complete step you know we haven't even revisited the issue for over a decade. Really, I think you made the point for engaging with our detention providers and they should have a voice in this process as I know they have had. But I don't know if we talked to the judges about this plan so we need to get a broader conversation. I think it's very clear until we do that, we're going to continue to be at odds. And the people that suffer in the process I fear are the children. I think detention facilities are one of the most depressing places on earth. I think, I liked actually the photographs, I do know who picked them, but they aren't any happy smiling faces in any of those pictures. I don't think a judge enjoys locking kids up. We've got this is a bigger problem, and we're going to deal with some through the rate making issues. I just want to encourage us that we've got to do a better job of bringing the rest of the constituencies together in solving this problem because to Rachel's earlier point you look at that list of things: alcoholic parents, divorced parents, parents who disappear, physical abuse, sexual abuse all those things that are an ACE score, as well as locking somebody up at the age of 13 in a place where they can't see the sun or outside, who don't know what's going to happen to them is also an ACE score. There was an article in the paper in the last several days about the ACLU and the Department Corrections, working out a plan to try to deal with H unit of death row unit in McAlester. I don't know if any of you have you been there. I have a number of times, and it's actually more pleasant, in some respects

than some of the potential facilities that I've been in, but the big complaint was well they can't see outside. And they're isolated physically by sound too. So, to a degree, the very complaints the ACLU is lodging against the Department Corrections for the very worst criminals, by definition, in our society where the housing is the very same kinds of places that we put children as young as age 13. And if you don't believe me, then just go to McAlester and go to the H unit, which compared to the old death row is actually pretty nice, but it's still pretty bad because of those things, the isolation and the inadequate ability to access fresh air and all those kinds of things. We're putting children in those same kinds of facilities and the ACLU said you can't do that to adults who you're going to execute. So, I know this is a tough problem for judges. I do, it's a tough problem for us. We really need to deal with it in a different way. I'd certainly hate for the ACLU to decide that okay now we've dealt with murderers and rapists, or whoever's on death row. And now we're going to deal with juvenile delinquents. I don't want that attention. My question, related to what Judge Foss said about custody kids getting priority treatment for placement in detention, we heard earlier we have fewer children who are currently in secure care. So I'm assuming that means that the problem to the degree that's existed in the past is even less than or fading? Or are we stacking kids up in detention because we can't get them a level E placement?

COO Holt: As of last week, we only had six kids waiting for placement in the state.

Chair Caldwell: Provide a contrast.

COO Holt: When I started here three years ago, our wait list between level E and medium was 80. Not every kid, I believe, all of those are waiting in detention. Our level E kids are technically waiting for community placement, so technically, they can wait in the community for those placements, but the trend is for judges, and certainly when I was a DA, and DAs is to ask for them to be detained while awaiting that placement and a lot of defense attorneys agree so that they wouldn't pick up additional crimes while waiting for their level E and then not qualify for level E. I'll say the priority given to OJA custody kids. So, you know, the majority of the time the OJA custody kid is the higher levels crime and is typically waiting placement, there is statutory language about the priority usage. I know Comanche County proudly has a bump list for their detention center and they rate, per statute, every kid and their level of need and appropriateness for detention. And again, all the kids that they're getting are from a judge, they don't have authority or say in who they're getting, but they maintain a bump list and if they get a call for a higher level, higher need, higher crime kid some of those lower level kids get released.

Judge Foss: When I was talking about OJA children having priority over, you know the kids that maybe are just coming into intake, I didn't really mean it so much in regards to detention. I saw it more from, we're not putting enough energies, maybe into keeping kids out in a way that is more therapeutic. A lot of our OJA kids, are kids that have been in municipal court for, I don't know, so many times before you even see them and intake and then they're getting right off the bat into custody.

Chair Caldwell: One of the things we've talked about as we've been working on this for the last number of months anyway is, if we can get we can right size the number of beds that were contracted for, not only can you provide but additional funding for those beds and the providers of those beds in the space but the excess funding, if there's some savings there, can be diverted into things like some legitimate and viable affordable alternatives to putting somebody in detention. I think before we finish this plan up, which I think our plan to get that done is before the end of the calendar year, hopefully we'll have some of that coming forward. I do think that giving judges options that aren't just turning the kid loose necessarily or locking them up will make a difference. We're working on that but it doesn't replace someone convening a really serious set of conversations around how are we going to deal with this.

Dr. Grissom: In that regard, any such meetings or conversations that we engage in with partner agencies it is incumbent upon us to make sure that the foundation of information regarding use of detention is within what we do working with juvenile justice and that there is a fundamental difference in the philosophy of intervention with children and the Department of Corrections and their death row unit. The adult system is by definition punitive in nature. And our system with juveniles is rehabilitative in nature we don't do custody and care. We do rehabilitation, treatment and intervention. So, detention is part of a rehabilitative system it is not in that in that sense as a punitive response. And I don't care if the kid is fresh off the street, on probation, out of an institution we do not incarceration for punitive purpose. We do it to maintain their safety so that they may receive rehabilitative services. So there's a philosophical position that I think we've got to make sure is clear to everybody at the table when we talk about use of detention.

Judge Foss: I think the problem is detention centers are not therapeutic in nature.

Chair Caldwell: That is correct.

Dr. Grissom: They are not but the system is.

Judge Foss: Even, and you know, Judge puts a kid in detention, you know your like, God, I don't want to put them in there. They are dank, it's dark, it's whatever but you don't have options. And, they are not getting treatment while they are sitting around in there.

Dr. Grissom: I will point out that if we go to detention centers in our state, in our system. There are considerable differences when you walk in the door, in how they feel and how kids look, and how kids are treated. So some of those detention centers are, in that sense, a much more therapeutic environment than other detention centers, which are much more punitive environment. And if I can walk in the door and feel it in the first 15 seconds, how's a kid feel who spending 15 days. I mean one day is an ACE. So, and by the way, ACEs of four or more have vastly higher likelihood ratios of all kinds of bad things. I don't want to go too far with this, but I want us to be clear to everybody at the table in this discussion that the system we're talking about. Our philosophy is intervention and rehabilitation and our intent is not punitive. Our confinement is for the purposes are for keeping kids safe so that they may be rehabilitated.

Chair Caldwell: I really appreciate you making that particular distinction because even though we're struggling with rewriting a plan, which we have a statutory obligation to do periodically, and we're struggling with what are the appropriate rates and locations for facilities and numbers of beds those are technical issues related to finance. This conversation regarding our purpose and our philosophy about the treatment facility is one that's evolving. I think that it's pretty clear that it's evolved further with respect to OJA than it has with all the various stakeholders inside the system. We're just a part of it of an overall system and so if we do have the opportunity to engage all the other stakeholders in a really serious conversation around what is this thing looks like, I hope you'll be there to articulate what you just said because I think if you don't start at the same place you can't get to the same destination. Right. I do think part of the problem is that you have different people with different sets of problems but also different sets of ideas. I know when I joined the board myself, I was asked to do so because I had a corrections background, and not necessarily a corrections mindset. In statute, in terms of how we qualify people to sit on this board, we're looking for people who are, who have a background of, how to properly incarcerate people. That's antithetical to interest. It's a part of a broader conversation and I know we've got terrible things to do here but I think this philosophical conversation is really important. If we do something that qualifies for an ACEs score anywhere inside this system, you know from start to finish it by definition is a therapeutic it's actually the opposite. We're piling onto the problems the kids showed up with. So any other questions about the presentation up until now or comments about the system in general or the plan or anything else that you'd like to say?

Director Buck: I appreciate the robustness of this conversation. As we continue to walk through this process, I hope the robustness continues because this is an incredibly important conversation. Detention is an important part of the system because it plays a very specific important role. And I want to applaud, again, Rachel mentioned in the slide, the leadership the board has taken by promulgating rates that authorized counseling services for people, who are who are detained. That was a very important piece of the equation. I want to applaud that. Also, we have several detention providers are with us today, I want to acknowledge the hard work they do, and remind us detention providers do not pick who walks into their doors. That is a system driven issue and I appreciate the leadership of the association. I'll actually be presenting at the association later this month, or next month. Apparently, next week, as well several staff members in working with them and, I appreciate their interest in helping forward this conversation. We are very fortunate in the state to have many stakeholders who like to engage and I appreciate that very much.

Mr. Clagg continued his presentation with slides showing the format being considered to determine the number of beds for a given budget cycle. Reviewed three fiscal years, reviewing current projected needs using most relevant and recent data. Making any changes as required by law, currently we are watching the youth that may be moved from jail to detention. Creating a 5 to 10% cushion for minor fluctuations. Reduce from that the adjustments for implementing alternatives to detention, which we will be promoting and funding.

Chair Caldwell: Questions or comments? We've had a static system for a really long time, which really requires us to re-enter this whole conversation around a state plan to make any changes, adopting a formula like this would allow us to create a dynamic system in which we don't have to revisit the entire plan or to make adjustments to beds and where they're located and how we're utilizing, and how we're paying for. We're going to consider the entire plan and a lot of other factors during the next two board meetings but this is really the linchpin of at least the part of the detention from a purchase point. And I think, although it's really common sensical, I don't know, how we came up with this idea but it really is a stroke of genius in terms of creating flexibility. Kevin creating this formula, which is not surprising to me, as all of you will observe that practically everything we do that is progress orientated he has his fingers in some way. I'm really excited about this. I think it gives us a year by year ability to react to what's going on inside our system. If we adopt this methodology, and it becomes central to the plan, as we move forward to the next 60 days I personally feel like even if we don't do anything else with the plan, compared to a decade or so we will make tremendous progress. In order though for us to do that. I think we need to have a vote of the board's thinking, do we support this or not. That's why there's a possible vote here we don't have to take action today, but I think it would move the plan forward and certainly give all the other stakeholders in the plan a notice of how we're going to deal with this financially. So, is there anyone who would like to make such a motion.

Vice Chair Youngblood moved to accept the methodology presented to the Board for determining the number of contracted juvenile detention beds needed statewide with a second by Ms. Worthen

Aye: Burrage, Caldwell, Emerson, Foss, Grissom, Jones, Worthen, and Youngblood
Absent: Tardibono

Methodology presented to the Board for determining the number of contracted juvenile detention beds needed statewide accepted.

Judge Foss: I have a quick question for Rachel. You said something about Comanche County has a system for bumping kids. What about a regional center?

COO Holt: Comanche county is regional. They do bump kids from other counties.

Judge Foss: Who does the bumping? Does it have to be the judge that put the child in there?

COO Holt: They are notified of the child's eligibility.

Judge Foss: Can they decline to bump?

COO Holt: No, I don't think they do. The judge in Comanche County, so far has been successful in taking ownership of that.

Judge Foss: Is it the same judicial district, everybody in that center.

COO Holt: A majority of them but they are a regional center so them may not be.

Judge Foss: I think you might want to take a look at that because if you have a situation in a regional center when you have kids from different counties what authority do you have to remove that child from the center.

COO Holt: Juvenile bureau counties the presiding judge.

Judge Foss: If you are not a juvenile bureau, you have a problem.

COO Holt: Correct. Comanche County is the only center that does that. We probably need to look at statute for making that possible for all regional centers.

Ms. Worthen: I just wanted to say how glad I was to hear that about getting kids to detention faster and out of adult facilities, because that was something that I had written down to just ask you about later so that's great. The only other stakeholder I want to make sure that we have at the table these conversation are schools. I've had a couple people call me about schools like making referrals I'm sure not getting the language, correct, but they're making referrals of kids to the DA, when they should be in the programs like Judge referenced they need to have more community response available there. So making sure that we connect them in this process as a stakeholder I think will be really important.

Vice Chair Youngblood: I would just like to make a comment. Thank you for the presentation in general it is always good to have those refreshers and also just to see where the pinch points are so that as we can be thinking during the time between meetings and as we research and as we read different things. It brings forward the information that we need to keep at the forefront and I really appreciate the definitions and where you see the pinch points and some of the positive outcomes that we can affect in the coming months through this plan.

Approval of Minutes for the September 18, 2019, Board Meeting

Vice Chair Youngblood moved to approve with a second by Judge Foss.

Aye: Burrage, Caldwell, Foss, Grissom, Worthen, and Youngblood

Abstain: Emerson and Jones

Absent: Tardibono

September 18, 2019, board minutes approved.

Discussion and/or possible vote to approve the 2020 meeting schedule

Chair Caldwell: Discussion of possible vote to approve the 2020 meeting schedule as a service and everyone need your board packet. I don't know whether you have a slide for that or not, but it really comes down to which Wednesday, Thursday, or Tuesday you want to meet on.

Director Buck: Mr. Chair, if I could supplement, I'm sorry. Action is not required on this item until the November board meeting. Okay, so we do have the flexibility you can make a commitment today. We have to file the dates by December 15, and our December meeting is after the 15th. So it's on the agenda today, if you're ready to act great but you can choose to defer.

Chair Caldwell: Everyone is here, except Mr. Tardibono, so we can go ahead and act. Is there anyone that has a day they would like to propose?

Dr. Grissom: I would prefer a Tuesday. Frankly, Wednesday is always a hassle because I keep looking at the clock.

Vice Chair Youngblood: Meeting during the first week of the month would make it difficult to have the finance committee meetings.

Vice Chair Youngblood moved to approve a 2020 meeting schedule for the 2nd Tuesday of every month with a second by Dr. Grissom.

Aye: Burrage, Caldwell, Emerson, Foss, Grissom, Jones, Worthen, and Youngblood
Absent: Tardibono

2020 meeting scheduled approved for the 2nd Tuesday of every month.

Discussion and/or possible vote to approve the year-to-date OJA Finance Report

Mr. Burrage moved to approve with a second by Judge Foss.

Aye: Burrage, Caldwell, Emerson, Foss, Grissom, Jones, Worthen, and Youngblood
Absent: Tardibono

Year-to-date OJA Finance Report approved.

Discussion and/or possible vote to approve 2019-2020 year-to-date Oklahoma Youth Academy Charter School Finance Report

Dr. Grissom moved to approve with a second by Ms. Emerson.

Aye: Burrage, Caldwell, Emerson, Foss, Grissom, Jones, Worthen, and Youngblood
Absent: Tardibono

2018-2019 year-to-date Oklahoma Youth Academy Charter School (OYACS) Finance Report approved.

Discussion and/or possible vote to approve modifications to the FY2020 encumbrances for the Oklahoma Youth Academy Charter School

Ms. Worthen moved to approve with a second by Ms. Jones.

Aye: Burrage, Caldwell, Emerson, Foss, Grissom, Jones, Worthen, and Youngblood

Absent: Tardibono

Modifications to the FY2020 encumbrances for the Oklahoma Youth Academy Charter School approved.

School Administration Report

Director of Education Melissa White and Principal Leticia Sanchez ran through their report.

Dr. Grissom: This logically dovetails with SDE's emphasis on trauma-informed education. A lot of the social gaps of the skillsets you are discussing are deficiencies that a result of their environment or norm. This is really good and I am glad to see it.

Dr. Emerson: Thank you for doing this because it because abuse prevention for our next generation. Hopefully, this skillset will serve these kids when they start parenting.

Buck: One of the interesting data points Len, and his team, in collaboration with DHS, are looking at young people who have navigated through OJA that have become a parent/ guardian in a deprived proceedings. This could lead to an investment in parenting programing if warranted.

Announcements/comments

Secretary Rockwell informed the Board they can tour the facilities located on-site.

New business; as authorized by 25 O.S. § 311(A) (9)

No new business.

Adjournment

Mr. Burrage moved to adjourn with a second by Judge Foss.


Aye: Burrage, Caldwell, Emerson, Foss, Grissom, Jones, Worthen, and Youngblood

Absent: Tardibono

Chair Caldwell adjourned the meeting at 11:03 a.m.

Minutes approved in regular session on the 20th day of November, 2019.

Prepared by:


Audrey Rockwell, Secretary

Signed by:


Tony Caldwell, Chair



Board of Juvenile Affairs

Rates and Standards Presentation

October 16, 2019

On September 16, 2019, the OJA Rates and Standards Committee voted unanimously to recommend for the Board of Juvenile Affairs the proposal represented by items within this presentation designated by RS20-001.

As required by statute, each component of these rate proposals were submitted to OMES for review and approval. Approval was granted by State Purchasing Director, Sam DuRegger on September 19, 2019. (Copy of the approval letter is in the board packet)

Summary

- More specific information is in the board packet – this presentation is only a general summary
- This Rate & Standards group will be effective immediately if approval by the Board of Juvenile Affairs.
- Rates were determined by looking at existing OHCA rates and providing a slight increase to incentivize agencies to provide this prioritized need as determined by existing assessment data from the youth involved in the Oklahoma juvenile justice system.

Summary (continued)

- The rate categories are based on existing best practices in treatment of substance use disorder and the federal Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) Residential Substance Abuse Treatment (RSAT) requirements.

Juvenile Relapse Avoidance Project (JRAP)-NEW RATES

Category	Rate	Unit
SUBSTANCE ABUSE ASSESSMENT (RS20-001-01)	110.33	Event
SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICE PLAN DEVELOPMENT & RELAPSE PREVENTION PLAN DEVELOPMENT (RS20-001-02)	142.08	Event
SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICE PLAN /RELAPSE PREVENTION PLAN UPDATE, REVIEW, OR MODIFICATION (RS20-001-03)	31.22	Event
SUBSTANCE ABUSE INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING (RS20-001-04)	20.57	15 min
SUBSTANCE ABUSE GROUP COUNSELING (RS20-001-05)	9.56	15 min/ Group Member